



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/445,289	05/11/2000	GALINA V MUKAMOLOVA	118160-00301	9774
86738	7590	09/25/2012		
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP BOSTON 265 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110			EXAMINER DEVI, SARVAMANGALA J N	
			ART UNIT 1645	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/25/2012	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@mccarter.com

<p align="center">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	Application No. 09/445,289	Applicant(s) MUKAMOLOVA ET AL.	
	Examiner S. DEVI, Ph.D	Art Unit 1645	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) S. DEVI (USPTO). (3) Ms. Yelena Margolin.
 (2) Attorney Maria Zaccharakis. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 19 September 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Applicant's amendment filed 07/02/12.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☒ 112 ☐ 102 ☐ 103 ☒ Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: All examined claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The scope of high G+C Gram-positive bacterial cells and of polypeptides having at least 50% sequence identity to amino acid residues 117 to 184 of SEQ ID NO: 2 discussed during the last interview were discussed further. Applicants pointed to the disclosure at paragraphs [0105], [0245], [0249 and [0254; Figures 6, 7 and 10; and Table 1 of the specification were discussed with regard to the single species of Micrococcus, i.e., M. luteus, and multiple species of Mycobacterium, their RP factors, the ability of M. luteus RP factor to stimulate the growth of M. luteus and more than one species of Mycobacterium were discussed. The showing in the post-filing references of Mukhamolova (2002) and Zhu, already of record, wherein RP factors from different species of Mycobacterium have been shown to stimulate the growth of different Mycobacterium species and of M. luteus were discussed. The issue of growth stimulation of non-luteus Micrococcus species and the non-Mycobacterium and non-Micrococcus high G+C Gram-positive bacterial cells by the recited polypeptides was discussed. Applicants would consider including the limitations from claim 157 in to claim 126.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/S. DEVI, Ph.D/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645

19 September 2012